UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

District of New Mexico

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V.

Juan Marquez-Alonso

Amended Judgment in a Criminal Case - Reason:

(For **Revocation** of Probation or Supervised Release)

Correction of Sentence for Clerical Mistake (Fed.R.Crim.P. 36)

Case Number: 1:05CR01222-001JB

USM Number: 24168-051

ГНЕ Г	DEFENDANT:	Defense Attorney: Margaret Katze, Appointed	
	admitted guilt to violations of condition(s) MC of the term of supervision. was found in violation of condition(s) after denial of guilt.		
The de	fendant is adjudicated guilty of these violations	s:	
Violati Numb	· ·	Violation Ended	
1	MC - The defendant committed ano	ther federal, state, or local crime 08-21-2009	
The de Act of		ough 2 of this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform	
☐ T	he defendant has not violated condition(s) and	is discharged as to such violation(s).	
		t notify the United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of stitution, costs, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid.	
		May 26, 2010	
Defen	dant's Soc. Sec. No.	Date of Imposition of Judgment	
11/17/	1967	/s/ James O. Browning	
Defen	dant's Date of Birth	Signature of Judge	
La Borsita San Javier Gran Morelos, Chih MX		Honorable James O. Browning United States District Judge	
Defendant's Residence Address		Name and Title of Judge	
,		June 8, 2010	
Defendant's Mailing Address		Date Signed	
Count	y of Residence		

AO 245D (Rev. 12/03) Judgment in a Criminal Case for Revocations

Sheet 2 Imprisonment Judgment Page 2 of 2

Defendant: Juan Marquez-Alonso Case Number: 1:05CR01222-001JB

IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 8 months.

1 month of said term shall run consecutively and 7 months of said term shall run concurrently to the sentence imposed in 2:09CR03311-001JB

Although advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines' sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidelines' punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 8 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public and effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

	The court makes these recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:		
×	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal. The defendant must surrender to the United States Marshal for this district:		
	□ as notified by the United States Marshal. The defendant must surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons: □ before 2 p.m. on □ as notified by the United States Marshal □ as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Service Office.		
	RETURN		
I have	executed this judgment by:		
Defer	dant delivered on to at with a Certified copy of this judgment.		

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Deputy United States Marshal